

Remarks/Arguments

Claims 16-20 are canceled by this amendment without prejudice.

Indication of allowability of claims 5-7 is appreciated.

According to the Office Action, the drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). In response, the objection is respectfully traversed. It is submitted that Applicant's feedback system is shown in Figure 3 (see page 8, line 21 of Applicant's specification: "A feedback system is provided between the current-measurement supply line 34 and the control line 6. The voltage on the control line 6 is controlled in closed loop manner to achieve the desired current through the display element 2. The control voltage can then be used for subsequent driving of the display element of the pixel during the remainder of the frame period."). Applicant's feedback system is more specifically shown in Figure 4 (see page 8, line 27 of Applicant's specification: "The feedback system is provided in a column driver of the display device, and Figure 4 shows one example of possible feedback system to be provided in the column driver"). It is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Further according to the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 8-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over US Publication 2003/0020413 ("Oomura") in view of European Patent EP1221686 ("Pae").

In response, the rejections are respectfully traversed as lacking sufficient factual support and failing to establish a prima facie case of obviousness in accordance with the established cases and statutory law.

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. It is a well settled law that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Among other things, Oomura fails to teach or suggest Applicant's feature of "the first and second switches being operated in complementary manner," as recited in claim 1. It is alleged that Oomura discloses this feature in Oomura's Fig. 6 (T3, T5). Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees.

Oomura teaches switches a first switch circuit T2 and a second switch circuit T5 (see paragraph [0054]), contrary to the Office Action's indication of T3 and T5. Oomura further teaches that the first and second switch circuits T2 and T5 are controlled by scanning signals SA and SB, respectively (see paragraph [0058]). As clearly stated in [0058], both switch circuits T2, T5 are either ON or OFF. Since T2 and T5 are controlled by separate lines and signals, they don't operate in complementary manner. In contrast to Oomura, Applicant's specification states that "the row conductor 4 is operated to turn off the address transistor 16 and the transistor 32 but to turn on the transistor 30" (see page 10, lines 5-7). It is respectfully submitted that in accordance with an embodiment of the present invention one signal controls the operation of two switches, which are complementary to each other.

As a result, Oomura fails to teach or suggest all the elements of claim 1. Pae fails to cure this deficiency in Oomura, as it is not relied upon in the Office Action for this feature of Applicant's invention.

Consequently, even if the two references are combined (Applicant's representative does not concede that Oomura and Pae are combinable, but simply states the above for the sake of argument), the combination would still fail to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of Applicant's invention.

At least for the above reasons, Applicant submits that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

Analysis of independent claim 12 is analogous to claim 1, as presented hereinabove. To avoid repetition, claim 12 will not be discussed in detail with the understanding that it is patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 1. Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12.

Claims 2-11 and 13-15 depend from independent claims, which have been shown to be allowable over the prior art references. Accordingly, claims 2-11 and 13-15 are also allowable by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional subject matter recited therein.

In light of these remarks, it is believed that Oomura and Pae, alone or in combination, do not anticipate or make obvious claims 1-15. Thus, it is submitted that claims 1-15 are allowable under both 35 U.S.C. §102 and 35 U.S.C. §103. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited. In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/

By: Brian Myers

Registration No.: 46,947

For: Larry Liberchuk

Registration No.: 40,352

Mail all correspondence to:

Larry Liberchuk, Registration No. 40,352
US PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001